

University of Michigan Law School

University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni
Survey Project

Class of 1956 Fifteen Year Report

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Class of 1956 Fifteen Year Report" (1971).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMLS Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI SURVEY
Class of 1956

I. INTRODUCTION

For six consecutive years the University of Michigan Law School has conducted a survey of its graduates in their fifteenth year after graduation. That there is an interest in such a survey on the part of graduates is indicated by the percentages of response: 81% of the Class of 1951, 78% of the Class of 1952, 77% of the Class of 1953, 77% of 1954, 80% of 1955, and 80% of the Class of 1956. The questionnaire has been kept virtually the same for each class to facilitate accumulation and comparison of data.

II. THE FRESHMAN CLASS OF 1953

Residence: Ninety-four (43%) of the 218 members of the graduating class of 1956 were Michigan residents; 30 came from Illinois; 24 from Ohio; 15 from Pennsylvania; 9 from New York; 7 from New Jersey; and 6 from Missouri. The remainder listed 17 other states.

One hundred and seventy-five questionnaires were returned in time for the analysis. Judged from the responses approximately 22% of the class had foreign-born parents and 56% had foreign-born grandparents. Two members who returned questionnaires were born outside the United States.

Academic Background: The class entered law school from 82 different undergraduate schools. Schools from all sections of the country were represented with the heaviest representation from the East and Midwest. As might be expected the University of Michigan supplied the largest number to the class. If the respondent group is used as the basis for judgment, approximately one-third of the students came from undergraduate schools of 20,000 or more. Another third came from schools whose size ranged from 1,000 to 5,000, one-seventh from schools ranging from 5,000 to 10,000, and the remaining had attended schools of under 1,000 or between 10,000 to 20,000. Ninety-five percent (208) of the 218 graduates in the Class of 1956 entered law school with a college degree. The remaining 5% (10) entered on a combined curriculum basis. Seventy-six (43%) of the 175 respondents had received some form of undergraduate honors, such as membership in honorary fraternities and societies, scholarships, prizes, and degrees awarded with distinction.

Age: The age range of the class at entrance to law school was from 18 through 36 with the average as well as the median for the entire 218 being 23. Sixty-eight members of the 218 graduates had some experience with the Armed Services before entering law school. Forty-five have spent at least six months in the Armed Services following graduation.

Education of Parents: The following table indicates the educational level

of the parents of the 175 respondents.

Table I
Educational Attainments of Father and Mother

		MOTHER							
		0	A	B	C	D	E	F	TOTAL
F A T H E R	0	2							2
	A		26	1	13	4	4		48
	B			2	1	1			4
	C		2		12	2	3		19
	D		3	1	14	7	6		31
	E		1		6	8	12	2	29
	F		1		8	17	11	5	42
	TO-TAL	2	33	4	54	39	36	7	175

Key: 0 - Didn't know D- 1 year or more college, but no degree
 A - Less than high school E - 4 years of college with degree
 B - Trade School F - More than one college degree
 C - High School diploma

Thirty-four parents and eleven grandparents were lawyers or had had some legal training.

Extracurricular Activities: Judging from the respondents, many members of the class had taken part in extracurricular activities prior to entering law school. The heaviest participation took place in high school where varsity athletics drew the most participants, and school or community politics and social or service organizations were a close second and third. Activity in school and community politics diminished as the class moved from high school to college. Participation in social or service organizations in college was only slightly higher than that of the high school years. Participation in more highly organized activities such as varsity athletics, work on school publications, and dramatic presentations fell off markedly after high school.

III. THE YEARS 1953-1956

Marital Status and Children: Forty-seven of the respondents were married when they began studying law. Forty-four more married at some time during

the law school years. Eighty have married since graduation, the majority within the first five years after graduation. At the present time 162 of the respondents are married; 4 have never married; and 7 indicate that their marriages have ended with divorce, separation or death. Twelve of the 162 have married more than once. At the time of graduation the respondents had a total of 62 children; now the total number is 508, or almost 3 per respondent.

Financial Support: The principal source of income and support during the law school years for most of the respondents was from parents or other members of the immediate family. The next most important was money earned during law school including summer earnings. The third most important source was G.I. or other veterans' benefits. Savings from pre-law school earnings constituted a close fourth.

Table II indicates how many of the respondents were employed in each regular academic year while in law school.

Table II
Number of Respondents Distributed by Year of Law School and
by Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week During School Terms

H O U R S P E R W E E K	LAW SCHOOL YEAR			
	First	Second	Third	
	None	106	81	78
	Less than 10	15	21	17
	10-15	23	30	32
	16-20	10	14	18
	More than 20	17	26	27
	No answer	4	3	3
	Total	175	175	175

In response to the question, "What percentage of your work while in law school, including summer employment, would you consider 'law related?'" 104 said none; 22 said 25% or less; 14, 26% to 51%; 11, 51% to 75%; and 16 answered 75% or more.

Grades: Scores for the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) were available for all but 8 of the 218 graduates. The high score was 713; the low was 324. The arithmetical mean or average for the 210 who took the test was 538; the median was 540. This is a better score than that scored

by approximately 70% of all persons then taking the test. For comparison, the average for the class entering in the fall of 1971 was 659, the median was 647, which is better than scores of approximately 95% of those currently being tested.

At the end of three years, most class members had maintained a law school grade average between 2.0 and 3.0. Thirty-nine had averages of 3.0 or better, and 18 had averages below 2.0. The average for the 218 was 2.69. Twenty-four percent had cumulative averages of 2.86 or above; 17% had averages below 2.1. The correlation of LSAT scores to law school grade averages is shown in the following table.

Table III
Correlation Between LSAT and Grade-Point Average

		Three-Year Cumulative Grade-Point Average							
		3.9-3.0		2.9-2.0		1.9-1.0		Total	
L S A T	700-799			1	100%			1	100%
	600-699	18	46%	20	51%	1	3%	39	100%
	500-599	15	14%	82	80%	6	6%	103	100%
	400-499	5	8%	48	79%	8	13%	61	100%
	300-399			6	100%			6	100%
Total		38	18%	157	75%	15	7%	210*	100%

* 8 had no LSAT

IV. THE YEARS 1956-1970

Residence: Of the 175 respondents, 170 are presently located in 30 states and the District of Columbia. Five others are located in foreign countries either with the Armed Services, the Diplomatic Corps or other governmental services, or in business. Table IV indicates the movement of the 175 from what was considered the home state at the time of admission to their present location.

Table IV

State	Number from State in 1953	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Arizona	0	1	+1
Arkansas	1	0	-1
California	0	16	+16
Colorado	1	2	+1
Connecticut	2	3	+1
Delaware	0	1	+1
Florida	1	5	+4
Georgia	1	1	0
Hawaii	2	2	0
Illinois	27	18	-9
Indiana	1	1	0

Table IV cont'd

State	Number from State in 1953	Number Presently Located in State	Net Change
Iowa	3	2	-1
Kansas	2	2	0
Kentucky	3	2	-1
Maine	0	1	+1
Massachusetts	1	2	+1
Michigan	71	45	-26
Minnesota	2	2	0
Missouri	5	4	-1
Montana	1	1	0
Nebraska	0	1	+1
New Jersey	6	3	-3
New York	6	12	+6
North Dakota	1	0	-1
Ohio	19	17	-2
Pennsylvania	14	10	-4
Texas	0	1	+1
Virginia	0	1	+1
Washington	0	3	+3
West Virginia	1	1	0
Wisconsin	4	2	-2
District of Columbia	0	8	+8
*****	*****	*****	*****
Serving in foreign countries		5	

Those listed in the column "Number Presently Located in State" are listed by the state in which they have their office. Occasionally the office and residence are in different states.

Ninety-seven respondents are now located in what was considered their home state during attendance in law school; 61 in what was considered their hometown prior to law school; and 58 are located in either the city or state in which they took their undergraduate training.

Size of Communities: Table V organizes the respondents in terms of the size of the community in which they work; it also compares figures for all lawyers throughout the country.

Table V

Size of Community	Class of '56			All Lawyers in the U.S.*	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Under 25,000	24	14%	43%	145,952	46.8%
25,000 to 100,000	32	18%			
100,000 to 200,000	20	11%			
200,000 to 500,000	15	9%	48%	44,988	14.2%
500,000 to 1,000,000	35	20%		125,916	38.9%
Over 1,000,000	49	28%			
Totals	175	100%		316,856	99.9%

* The 1967 Lawyer Statistical Report, American Bar Foundation, 1968

Table VI shows the correlation between the sizes of "hometowns" and present location of class members.

Table VI

Size of City of Present Location	Size of City of Origin						Total
	Under 25,000	25,000 to 100,000	100,000 to 200,000	200,000 to 500,000	500,000 to 1,000,000	Over 1 M	
Under 25,000	14	3	2	1	1	3	24
25,000 to 100,000	7	12	2	1		10	32
100,000 to 200,000	6	5	5	3	1		20
200,000 to 500,000	4	1	1	6		3	15
500,000 to 1,000,000	12	4		2	12	5	35
Over 1,000,000	13	7	4	2	2	21	49
Total	56	32	14	15	16	42	175

Table VII shows the correlation between size of community and the various occupations of the members of the Class of '56

Table VII
Correlation Between Size of City of Present Location
& Occupation

Size of City Where Working	Occupation						TOTAL
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Under 25,000	13	5		3		1	22
25,000 to 100,000	21	3	2			6	32
100,000 to 200,000	14	2	2			4	22
200,000 to 500,000	7	6				1	14
500,000 to 1,000,000	25	5	1	1		3	35
Over 1,000,000	25	14		1		8	48
Total	105	35	5	5		23	173*

* 2 no answer as to occupation

Key: A - Lawyers in private practice or in a law firm
B - Lawyers, salaried other than law firms (excluding judges, teachers and legislators)
C - Educators
D - Judge
E - Legislator
F - Non-lawyer

Further information about members in these categories was obtained through the questionnaire. Of the 35 lawyers in Category B (salaried, other than judges, teachers or legislators) 7 are employed by federal, state or local government; 27 are employed by organizations for profit, and 1 checked "other." Four in Category C (educator) are with law schools, 2 as professors of law, 1 teaching other than law, and one in administration. The remaining respondent in this category is teaching in a college. Four of the 5 in Category D (judge) are in state or local courts. Three of these are in trial courts; the fourth checked "other." The fifth judge did not designate his court. One in this category is a Federal Hearing Examiner who checked "judge" because it offered the closest fit. Of the 23 in Category F (non-lawyer) 2 are sole or co-proprietors; 9 are employees in supervisory positions; 1 is an employee in a non-supervisory position; 6 are employed by government in non-law capacity; and 5 checked "other."

The questionnaire also requested information on the kinds of work performed by those in Categories B and F (see above). Of salaried employees (either lawyer or non-lawyer, working in an organization other

than a law firm and excluding judges, teachers and legislators) 27 are legal staff in corporate or governmental organizations. The remainder have diverse occupations which include management consultant, state or national government service including diplomacy, investigator, life insurance examiner, industrial relations or personnel work, investments, trusts and estates, editor, and various executive positions. Twenty-five supervise from 1 to 10 employees; 16 supervise 11-50; and 11 supervise over 51.

Combining Categories A and B (i.e. all those working as lawyers whether employed or in private practice, a total of 140) the questionnaire asked for the number of other lawyers in the respondent's office or department. Table VIII gives the results.

Table VIII
Respondents Distributed According to Number of
Other Lawyers in Office or Department

Other Lawyers	0	1-3	4-7	8-15	16-30	31-50	Over 51	No ans.
Respondents	9	23	37	19	10	12	11	19

According to a July 1966 report by the ABA Committee on Economics of Law Practice as well as a 1968 publication entitled WHERE, published by Lawyer Placement Information Services, ABA, the number of lawyers in solo practice has been steadily declining since 1948, while the number in partnerships has been increasing. The ABA Committee on Economics of Law Practice states that between 1961 and 1964 approximately 10,000 lawyers joined partnerships and a growing number are becoming associates in practice. The Class of '56 seems to reflect this trend with 82% of the respondents in partnerships, if in private practice. There is also evidence in the Class of '56 of a tendency to form professional corporations rather than partnerships in the practice of law.

Table IX
Lawyers in Private Practice

	Class of 1956			
	Number	% of Those In Private Practice	% of All 1956 Re- spondents	% of All Lawyers in Practice (1966)*
Sole practitioner	11	10%	6%	56%
Sole practitioner in non-partnership	6	6%	3%	
Member of a partner- ship	86	82%	49%	35%
Employee of a partnership	2	2%	1%	9%
(respondents not in private practice)	(71)		(41%)	

* ECONOMIC FACTS ABOUT LAW PRACTICE, Committee on Economics of Law Practice
ABA, July 1966

A demographic survey of its readers conducted by the ABA Journal and reported in the December 1970, Volume 56 issue, indicated that 19.8% of those replying were sole practitioners and 52.9% of those replying were partners or associates in a firm. This percentage was based on 552 replies. The respondents of the Class of '56 seem to follow this trend.

Thirty-three of the 105 private practitioners, Category A (see Table VII), have been in private practice for approximately 15 years. Sixty more have been in private practice for 10 through 14 years. Sixty-six of those in partnership started in established firms; 16 started with another lawyer then in solo practice; and 5 started by themselves and have added others. Fifty-two of 86 respondents who are members of a law partnership report that their firm has a written agreement. Included in this figure are those who belong to professional corporations.

The ABA ECONOMIC FACTS ABOUT LAW PRACTICE mentioned earlier states that the average lawyer is compensated for only 5 1/2 hours of an eight-hour day. It also states that about one-third of a lawyer's professional time is devoted to unpaid legal work, education, office management and public service. The questionnaire asked that the respondents indicate the approximate division of their time (average hours per week) during the most recent 12 months among the following categories: chargeable time for clients, non-chargeable time for clients, and career-oriented work. While not all of the 105 practicing lawyers answered this, the responses would indicate they manage more chargeable hours than the 5 1/2 given in the ABA report. Table X indicates the way the Class's 105 practicing lawyers divided their time during the most recent 12 months.

Table X
Division of Time for Practicing Lawyers in the
Class of '56

	Average Hours Per Week						No ans.
	Under 10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	
Chargeable time	3 (3%)		21 (20%)	51 (49%)	14 (13%)	12 (11%)	4 (4%)
Non-chargeable time	67 (64%)	17 (16%)	3 (3%)		1 (1%)		17 (16%)
Career-oriented Work	62 (60%)	18 (17%)			2 (2%)		23 (22%)

The hours spent by each respondent in all three categories were totaled with the following results. Forty-three (41%) of the practicing lawyers spend 40 to 50 hours per week in professional effort of one kind or another; 26 (25%) spend about 55 hours; 15 (14%) spend over sixty hours. Seventeen (16%) spend up through 35 hours per week. The remaining 4% did not answer the question.

Specialties: Those members of the class working as lawyers whether in practice, for government, or for a corporation, were asked to indicate their specialty, or specialties; if they had any. "Specialty" was defined as an area of law in which one spends more than 25% of his working time. Members were asked to limit themselves to three responses. Classifying occupations by subject matter has only limited value in revealing a lawyer's true function. But lawyers are accustomed to identifying themselves in these terms and thus should have a fair notion of the meaning of a classification of the sort listed below. Table XI lists specialties in order of frequency of response.

Table XI

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>Number of Specialists</u>
Corporation & Business Counseling	48
Trust & Probate	32
Real Property	21
Trial, General	19
Trial, Negligence	16
Securities Issuance & Regulation	14
Taxation	14
Negligence	11
No area accounts for 25% of time	11
Antitrust	10
Banking & Commercial Law	9
Other	8
Labor Law	7
Insurance	7
Administrative Law	6
Criminal Law	5
Domestic Relations	5
Legislation	5
Patent, Trademark & Copyright	5
Workmen's Compensation	5
Municipal	4
International Law	4
Employee Benefits	4
Oil, Gas & Mineral	3
Admiralty	2
Public Utility Regulation	1
Government Contracts	1
Bankruptcy - Collections	0
Aviation	0

The respondents were also asked to check membership certificates, some of which suggest specialized practice of interests.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Local Bar Association	137
State Bar Association	151
Federal Bar Association	18
American Bar Association	115
Patent Bar	4
American Trial Lawyers' Association	23
American College of Trial Lawyers	0
International Assoc. of Insurance Counsel	2
CPA	6
CLU	0
Real Estate License	2
Other	13

One hundred and twelve respondents are admitted to practice before one state court, 47 in two states, and 10 in three or more. Six did not answer this.

Career Objective: Seventy-eight of the 175 respondents entered law school with a particular career objective in mind, and 66 of these had the same career objective in mind at graduation time. Forty others left law school with a career objective. Presumably 12 of these 40 changed their career objective some time after their freshman year, and the remaining 28 acquired an objective while attending law school. Eighty-five of those who had a career objective at graduation are presently achieving it, and most feel it was a sound choice; of these 85, 58 are among the high earners (\$25,000 or more average yearly income, excluding taxes and investments). Sixty-two of the 85 are practicing lawyers or members of a law firm.

Stability: Judging from the respondents, the Class of '56 gives evidence of occupational stability. One hundred and ten of the 175 have held positions with no more than two firms or organizations, while 31 more have been connected with only 3. Eighty-three (47%) have been with their present organization for more than 10 years. Twelve have been with their present firm or organization for 10 years; 3 for 9; 7 for 8; 3 for 7; 9 for 6; 9 for 5; 6 for 4; 5 for 3; 13 for 2; and 13 for 1. Forty-five have had their careers interrupted by military service; 5 by travel and study abroad for 6 months or more; and 19 have done post-graduate work in law, business, accounting or other fields, full time, for periods of six months or more.

Seventy-seven of the 105 practitioners have been in practice for 12 years or more. Fifty of these have had their own office or have been with the same firm for the same length of time. Only 6 of the remaining 27 have been with more than 3 firms since leaving law school. Seventeen of the 105 practitioners are in practice by themselves, and

86 are members of a partnership or professional corporation.

Both lawyers and non-lawyers were asked to indicate in chronological order the kinds of positions they have held since graduation. There was opportunity to indicate 6. Not counting military service (except for career officers) the first position held by 92 of the respondents was an employee of a law firm. Eighteen others took positions suggested by the following descriptions: research, federal government positions (patent office, FBI, civil servant, foreign service, & claims), law librarian, CPA, police, insurance, a co-fiduciary in a private trustee office, a law school instructor, and as a graduate student. Twelve started their careers practicing by themselves. Twelve began as corporate employees (non-law). Eleven were employed as lawyers for corporations. Eleven accepted positions with city, county, state, or federal government (excluding judicial clerkships, and federal government positions mentioned above). Eight accepted judicial clerkships. Seven became partners in a law firm, and 1 continued a military career.

Twenty-two respondents have held one kind of position since graduation; 65 have held two kinds; 48, 3; 15, 4; 16, 6; and 6 have held 6.

Income: Members were asked to indicate their average income (before taxes, excluding income from investments) during four separate periods since graduation; the first three years; the second three years; the next four years; and the most recent four years. Table XII reveals the growth of income over the 15 years since graduation. During the first three years out of law school 80% of 164* members earned less than \$7,500 and only 1% of the respondents who answered this section earned over \$12,500. During the last four years 98% of the 163** answering this section earned \$12,500 or over.

*11 did not give a figure the first four years

** 12 did not give a figure for the most recent four years.

Table XII
Average Annual Income
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments) Since Graduation

Years Since Graduation From Law School									
	First 3		Next 3 (4 thru 6)		Next 4 (7 thru 10)		Most Recent 4		
Range	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Below \$3,000	13	7%	Below \$7500	18*	Below \$10,000	9*	Below \$15,000	8*	
\$3,000-4,999	33	19%							10%
\$5,000-7,499	85	49%							
\$7,500-9,999	25	14%	56	32%	10	6%			
\$10,000-12,499	8*	5%	48	28%					
\$12,500-14,999			32	18%					34
\$15,000-17,499			9*	5%	33	18%	5	3%	
\$17,500-19,999					23	13%	13	7%	
\$20,000-22,499					24	14%	15	9%	
\$22,500-24,999					30*	17%	15	9%	
\$25,000-29,999							24	14%	
\$30,000-34,999							19	10%	
\$35,000-40,000							24	14%	
Over \$40,000							40	23%	
No answer	11	6%	12	7%	12	7%	12	7%	
Total	175	100%	175	100%	175	100%	175	100%	

* categories combined because of small number of respondents in some.

Tables XIII, XIV, and XV permit a comparison of average incomes by occupation during the most recent 4 years.

Table XIII
Private Practice Lawyers
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes & Excluding Investments)

	Sole Practitioner	Member of Partnership	Sole Practitioner In Non-partnership Assn.	Employee of Partnership
Below \$15,000	4*		2*	
\$15,000-17,499		3*		
\$17,500-19,999				
\$20,000-22,499		4		
\$22,500-24,999	4*	6	4*	2*
\$25,000-29,999		10		
\$30,000-34,999		14		
\$35,000-40,000		16		
Over \$40,000		26		
No answer	3	7	0	0
Total	11	86	6	2

*figures combined because of small number involved

In an article entitled, "Income of Lawyers, 1962-63," by Cullen Smith and N. S. Clifton, published in the November 1966 AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, the average income of lawyer-partners was reported to be \$18,260 net before taxes while that of sole practitioners was \$8,150.

In the demographic study entitled "In Search of the Average Lawyer," which was referred to on page 9 of this report, the average annual income reported by respondents was \$27,960, the median was \$21,260, which is probably more realistic.

Table XIV
Salaried Lawyers Other Than Law Firms
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Government	Organization for Profit	Other
Below \$15,000	5*	5*	
\$15,000-17,499			
\$17,500-19,999			
\$20,000-22,499		7*	
\$22,500-24,999			
\$25,000-40,000	2	15	
No answer	0	0	1
Total	7	27	1

*figures combined because of small number

Table XV
Non-lawyer*
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Non-lawyer Respondents
Below \$15,000	9**
\$15,000-17,499	
\$17,500-19,999	
\$20,000-22,499	10**
\$22,500-24,999	
\$25,000-34,999	5
Over \$35,000	10
No answer	1
Total	35

*including judges, educators and legislators

**figures combined

Table XVI compares the average income of practicing lawyers for the most recent four years with those in all other categories listed in the questionnaire.

Table XVI
Practitioners Compared with All Other Categories
Income - Most Recent Four Years
(Before Taxes and Excluding Investments)

Income Range	Practitioners		All Others	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below \$15,000	3	3%	5	8%
\$15,000-17,499	2	2%	3	4%
\$17,500-19,999	2	2%	11	16%
\$20,000-22,499	6	6%	9	13%
\$22,500-24,999	7	7%	8	12%
\$25,000-29,999	12	13%	12	18%
\$30,000-34,999	15	16%	3	4%
\$35,000-40,000	19	20%	6	9%
Over \$40,000	29	31%	11	16%
No answer	10		2	
Total	105	100%*	70	100%**

*based on 95

** based on 68

V. HIGH EARNERS

One hundred and seven of the 175 respondents indicated that their average income for the most recent four years was \$25,000 or more. These have been designated "high earners." The amount of money one earns is not the only or possibly even the best measure of success, but certainly it is one of the most common. What follows is an analysis of the high earners group which parallels that of the entire class. An analysis of the characteristics of this group should indicate whether factors which employers regard as important actually bear any relationship to financial success.

Age; Marital Status and Children: The average age of the high earners

when they entered law school was 23 - the same as that for the entire 218 graduates. Thirty-two were married at the time they entered law school. Thirty-one married at some time during their three years in law school. By graduation these 63 had had 38 of the total of 62 children for the class. Currently 103 of the high earners are married and account for 315 children of the 508 total for the 175 respondents. Five of the high earners have been married more than once.

Table XVII compares the marital status of the high earners with that of the remaining 68.

Table XVII

High Earners (107)			Remaining (68)	
30%	(32)	Married at time of entrance	22%	(15)
29%	(31)	Married while in law school	19%	(13)
96%	(103)	Now married	87%	(59)
0%	(0)	Never married	6%	(4)
4%	(4)	Divorced, separated or spouse deceased	4%	(3)
5%	(5)	More than one marriage	10%	(7)

Financial Support: The principal sources of support listed by the high earners are very similar to those for the entire 218. The order of importance was exactly the same - parental or family, first; earnings during law school years including summer earnings, second; and G.I. Bill or other veterans' benefits, third. Table XVIII compares the average number of hours worked per week by the high earners with the average for the remaining respondents in each of the three years in law school.

Table XVIII
Average Hours Employed While in Law School

Hours Per Week	First Year		Second Year		Third Year	
	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others	High Earners	All Others
None	59%	63%	46%	47%	46%	41%
Less than 10	11%	5%	12%	12%	6%	16%
10-15	12%	15%	16%	19%	19%	18%
16-20	9%	1%	10%	4%	12%	7%
More than 20	7%	13%	15%	15%	16%	15%
No answer	2%	3%	1%	3%	1%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

One hundred and four of the 107 high earners took the LSAT, scoring an arithmetical mean (average) of 548. The median was 543. Of the remaining 68 respondents all but 3 took the test, and the mean for this group was 530; the median was between 536 and 543. The grade point averages of the two groups are not significantly different, 2.70 for the high earners and 2.86 for the remaining 68. Twenty-six percent of the high earners had grade point averages in the 3.0 and up range against 13% of the remaining 68. Four percent of the high earners had averages in the 1.0 to 2.0 range compared with 5% of the other 68. Forty-three percent (46) of the high earners had received scholastic honors of some sort while enrolled in undergraduate school, while 44% (30) of the remaining respondents had received such honors.

Size of Community: Table XIX shows the distribution among cities of various sizes in which the 107 were raised and the cities in which they now work compared with the remaining respondents.

Table XIX
Comparison of Population of City Where Respondents Were
Raised and That in Which They Currently Work

Population of City	107 High Earners				68 Others			
	Raised No.	In %	Work No.	In %	Raised No.	In %	Work No.	In %
Under 25,000	37	35%	14	13%	19	28%	10	15%
25,000 to 100,000	19	18%	21	20%	13	19%	11	16%
100,000 to 200,000	7	7%	13	12%	7	10%	7	10%
200,000 to 500,000	11	10%	6	5%	4	6%	9	13%
500,000 to 1,000,000	9	8%	20	19%	7	10%	15	22%
Over 1,000,000	24	22%	33	31%	18	27%	16	24%
Total	107	100%	107	100%	68	100%	68	100%

Among both the high earners and the remaining 68 the tendency seems to be to work in a larger city than that in which one was raised. Fifty-five percent of the high earners are working in cities with a population of 200,000 or more and 59% of the 68 others are working in cities of comparable size. The questionnaire did not provide any basis for judging relative cost of living.

Occupations: Seventy-five high earners are in private practice or law firms; 17 are salaried employees working as lawyers; 2 are judges; 7 of the 13 high earners who are in non-law occupations are employed in

supervisory positions (non-government); 2 are sole or co-proprietors and the remaining 4 check "other". Seventy-six of the high earners have been with no more than 2 firms or organizations since graduation. This is 71% of the high earners. Thirty-four (50%) of the remaining respondents have been with no more than 2 firms or organizations. Seventeen (16%) additional high earners have been with no more than 3 compared with 14 (20%) of the remaining 68. Sixty-nine (64%) of the high earners have been with their present firm or organization for more than 10 years as compared with 18 (26%) of the other 68 respondents.

Sixty-six of the 75 high earners in private practice are members of a partnership or professional corporation, 5 are sole practitioners, 3 are sole practitioners in non-partnership association with other lawyers, and 1 is an employee of a partnership. Sixty-two of the 75 have been in private practice for 12 years or longer.

Specialties: Of the 29 categories listed in the questionnaire only 3 were not checked by at least 1 high earner. These were Aviation, Bankruptcy-Collections, and Government Contracts. Table XX tabulates the numbers and percentages of high earners in 10 categories and compares them with similar figures for the remaining practitioners. Each of the 10 categories was checked by at least 10 respondents working as lawyers (see Table XI). The respondents were invited to check as many as three specialties.

Table XX

<u>Specialties</u>	High Earners		Remaining Practitioners	
	No.	%*	No.	%**
Corporation & Business Counseling	39	42%	9	18%
Trust & Probate	24	26%	8	17%
Real Property	17	18%	4	8%
Trial, General	13	14%	6	13%
Trial, Negligence	12	13%	4	8%
Taxation	11	12%	3	6%
Securities Issuance & Regulation	9	10%	5	10%
Antitrust	8	9%	2	4%
No area accounts for more than 25% of time	7	8%	4	8%
Negligence, Investigation & Negotiation	5	5%	6	13%

*Percents based on 92 (number of high earners who are working as lawyers in private practice, a law firm, or as salaried lawyers in other than a law firm, excluding judges, teachers and legislators).

** Percents based on 48 arrived at in same manner as that of high earners.

Sixty-one (81%) of the 75 high earners who are lawyers in practice or with a law firm log anywhere from 35 to over 60 hours per week of chargeable time while only 16 (62%) of the 26 others who answered this register so much income-producing time. Sixty-nine (92%) of the 75 high

earners spend from 5 to 20 hours in non-chargeable time for clients. Seventy-three percent of the remaining 26 lawyers in private practice indicated a similar amount of hours in non-chargeable time. Sixty-five (87%) of the 75 high earners spend 5 to 20 hours per week in career-oriented work other than for clients. Sixty-five percent of the other practicing lawyers who responded spend an equal amount of time in career development.

When the entire 107 high earners are considered, it is found that 71, or 66%, have participated in formalized courses in law or other fields since graduation. Forty-three have held appointive or elective office; 66 have been active in civic affairs. Table XXI compares these activities of the high earners with those of the rest of the respondents.

Table XXI

	High Earners	Others
Post-law Education	66% (71)	53% (36)
Appointive or Elective Offices	40% (43)	40% (27)
Civic Activities	62% (66)	47% (32)

VI. THE LAW SCHOOL PROGRAM

The class was asked to indicate whether course offerings in the following subjects should be increased or decreased. The suggested increases substantially outweigh suggested decreases. Many respondents felt they lacked sufficient information about the present curriculum to make judgments.

Table XXII
Suggested Increases

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>First Choice</u>	<u>Second Choice</u>	<u>Third Choice</u>
Commercial Law (including corp.)	20	13	10
Contracts & Remedies	6	4	3
Criminal Law	4	2	3
Domestic Relations	0	0	0
Estate Planning	3	12	18
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	2	3	6
Legal Writing	30	20	12
Non-law courses in gov., finance, phil- osophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	14	11	12
Professional Responsibility	8	10	4
Public or Private International Law	3	1	1
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	25	15	10
Real Property (including oil & gas)	1	3	0
Taxation	6	11	9
Torts & Personal Injury	2	2	4
Administrative Law	3	9	12
Municipal Law	0	5	4
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	1	6	6
Other	11	6	5

Suggested Decreases

Commercial Law (including corp.)	1	0	1
Contracts & Remedies	2	1	2
Criminal Law	4	4	2
Domestic Relations	8	6	5
Estate Planning	2	2	1
Jurisprudence (including legal history)	17	8	4
Legal Writing	3	3	2
Non-law courses in gov. finance, phil- osophy, or other courses of possible relevance to lawyers	17	6	5
Professional Responsibility	1	5	2
Public or Private International Law	11	11	5
Procedure, Evidence & Trial Practice	3	4	1
Real Property (including gas & oil)	5	3	1
Taxation	0	2	0
Torts & Personal Injury	5	2	3
Administrative Law	1	3	7
Municipal Law	1	4	7
Constitutional Law (including Civil Rights)	0	1	5
Other	1	1	0

Under a section called Postgraduate Information the question was asked, "What of your law school training is contributing most meaningfully to your present job ability?". There was also a space provided for Comments in the questionnaire. Almost all the respondents took advantage of these opportunities to express themselves concerning their law school experience both favorably and unfavorably.

In answering the specific question mentioned in the above paragraph some named particular courses such as Commercial Law, International Law, Contracts, Constitutional Law, courses in Real Estate, Corporation Law, Taxation, Civil Procedure, Trusts & Estates, Evidence, and Admiralty Law. Others found it difficult to single out specific courses but felt that the entire curriculum had proved of value. The most common benefits mentioned other than certain courses were those of learning to analyze facts, to organize materials, to use research materials, and to be objective. Many mentioned how helpful their experience in Case Club, Moot Court, Campbell Competition, and Law Review had been. Some felt the most valuable contribution the law school had made for them was the association with their classmates and with certain professors. One felt that the law school developed basic academic background and that this was all one could expect, that specific knowledge must be acquired on the job after graduation through practice, ICLE, etc. This individual felt the University of Michigan had given excellent preparation for a career in law. Many respondents were very pleased with the training they had received at the University of Michigan Law School stating that its graduates measure well against graduates of other leading law schools, and they felt their time spent at Michigan had been very worthwhile.

However, not all respondents were enthusiastic about the law school's contribution to their present situation. A few answered that they did not know of anything studied during their law school years which had proved of benefit, and one respondent said that in many ways the curriculum had proven somewhat detrimental. Some felt too much emphasis had been placed on the case-work system and not enough on the practical aspects of the practice of law. One suggested that an improvement in teaching methods would be from the case method, judicial, to the case method, problems. Another stated that while Michigan had been a grand experience, he had learned little about how to be a lawyer, and felt that an "internship" would be a most desirable addition to law training. Several felt that law schools have failed the profession in the sense that they do not prepare the student for the business problems and how to deal with clients. It was suggested that a pre-law requirement might well be courses in psychology, philosophy, English, and business. A few complained of the "ivory tower" aspect of their law training and that the approach to law of too many professors was too logical. Another expressed the opinion that Michigan as well as other law schools are academically directed to the protection of solicitors, not barristers or advocates of which he felt American jurisprudence stands in desperate

need. Other suggestions for the improvement of law training were: more instruction in exam writing, communication of study techniques to first year students, more test papers returned with grades so a student can identify his weaknesses, and more personal interest by the faculty in both the students and the graduates. Some felt quite bitter about the seeming lack of interest on the part of professors as well as administrators. The need for closer investigation into financial need was mentioned because it was felt that a "C" or "D" student may well be a "C" or "D" student because he must work long hours at a job to support himself thus limiting the time and energy he can apply to his studies. The hope that the law school is at present more thoroughly and completely evaluating its students was expressed, as well as the hope that the prospective employer is given a full picture of the graduating senior's law school career.

There were statements concerning the law profession in general. In the opinion of some there are far too many charlatans, schemers, and egocentrics practicing law. Others stated they were appalled by the dishonesty of lawyers and the incompetency of judges. In regard to this last it was suggested more emphasis should be placed on what happens in the court room instead of so much discussion of appellate decisions, the feeling being that often the appellate courts change the facts to fit the decision. Another respondent suggested a post-graduate course entitled "How to Be a Judge" for practitioners who have been out of school 3 to 5 years and that such a course be a mandatory requirement for the Bench. One respondent expressed the opinion that society is sick and the principal profession at fault is that of law - next, that of politics. In his opinion lawyers have made no contribution to American society since 1930.

Still another respondent said as a Black Man he knew he had problems not encountered by his white colleagues; that in spite of advances in this country in the area of race relations, it is still difficult for the Black lawyer to compete in the legal arena.

Concerns were expressed by some that the college and university picture nationally is very distressing (including the University of Michigan) especially as regards discipline, admission standards, and supine reaction to militant and/or disorderly groups, campus unrest, etc. Conviction was expressed that complete academic freedom has not, and will not, produce the end product desired. Several were in favor of a tough, broad, legal education. Also many were opposed to a "publish or perish" ultimatum, feeling that the main function of a school, regardless of what level, was to teach.

In addition to comments about the curriculum, the school, and the profession of law in general, there were some comments concerning the questionnaire itself. Some were pleased with the opportunity of helping the school take stock of itself through its alumni. A few

were appalled at the attempted invasion of privacy and dismayed that so many of their classmates had answered the questionnaire. Feeling toward the questionnaire ran a gamut from pleasure, to indifference, to a sense of obligation, to complete dislike. The majority regarded the questionnaire favorably, but it is evident that 36* did not regard it of sufficient interest to answer.

The law school is most grateful to all those members of the Class of '56 who took the time to fill in and return the questionnaire or write a letter in its place.

* of the 41 who did not return the questionnaire or reply in any fashion, 5 were either deceased or address unknown.